



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,255	01/24/2002	Masashi Hamada	1232-4812	2744

27123 7590 04/13/2006
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/057,255	Applicant(s) HAMADA, MASASHI	
	Examiner Ranodhi Serrao	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-20,22-24,26-35,38,61 and 84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-20,22-24,26-35,38,61 and 84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 19 January 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 12-20, 22-24, 26-35, 38, 61, and 84 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. The applicant argued in substance the newly added limitation, "a select step of making the server automatically select...at least on data server located in an area which is different from an area of user's address..." The new grounds teach these and the added limitations. See rejections below.

4. The applicant furthermore argued that Beeler fails to disclose the server automatically select from the plurality of data servers at least one data server. However, in col. 2, lines 48-58, Beeler states, "VINCA's Standby Server 32 with Autoswitch, adds automatic switching between servers on failure...Communication between the source and target servers is accomplished via a dedicated, proprietary interface." It is clear from these statements that Beeler teaches the invention as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr. (5,189,020) and Petersen (2002/0103907).

2. As per claim 1, Beeler, Jr. teaches a data management method using a network system which includes a server, a client terminal (see Beeler, Jr., column 9, lines 16-29) and a plurality of data servers (see Beeler, Jr., col. 10, lines 20-31), comprising: the reception step of making the server receive a user's data storage request from the client terminal (see Beeler, Jr., column 9, lines 4-15); the select step of making the server automatically select from the plurality of data servers at least one data server (see Beeler, Jr., col. 2, lines 48-58 and col. 6, lines 44-51); and the storage step of making the server send data associated with the data storage request to the selected at least one data server, and store the data in the selected at least one data server (see Beeler, Jr., column 10, lines 20-31). But fails to teach located in an area which is different from an area of user's address registered by the user of the client terminal. However, Petersen teaches located in an area which is different from an area of user's address registered by the user of the client terminal (see Petersen, ¶ 13 and 64). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beeler Jr., to located in an area which is different from an area of user's address

Art Unit: 2141

registered by the user of the client terminal in order to store data on a network at a different location from a client requesting storage (see Petersen, ¶ 13).

3. As per claim 3, Beeler, Jr. and Petersen teach wherein when: the server selects a plurality of data servers in the select step, the server sends the data associated with the data storage request to the respective selected data servers (see Beeler, Jr., column 9, line 50-column 10, line 2).

4. As per claim 5, Beeler, Jr. and Petersen teach the step of making the server encrypt the data associated with the data storage request, and wherein the storage step includes the step of: making the server send the data encrypted by different methods to the respective data servers, and store the data in the data servers (see Beeler, Jr., column 17, lines 10-21).

5. As per claim 6, Beeler, Jr. and Petersen teach the step of making the server periodically acquire the encrypted data from the data servers (column 17, lines 10-21); the step of making the server decrypt the acquired data; and the step of making the server compare the decrypted data (see Beeler, Jr., column 18, lines 7-19).

6. Claims 10 and 12-14 are rejected by Beeler, Jr. and Petersen accordingly as per claim 1 above.

7. Claims 4, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Satomi et al. (6,347,384).

8. As per claim 4, Beeler Jr. and Petersen teach the mentioned limitations of the claim 1 above and furthermore Petersen teaches wherein the select step includes the

Art Unit: 2141

step of: making the server select at least the data server located in a different area from the area of the user's address (see Petersen, ¶ 13). But fail to teach the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information, and search for an area with a low disaster rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information, and wherein the select step includes the step of: making the server select at least the data server located in a different area from the registered area, and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence. However, Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information (see Satomi et al., column 2, line 63-column 3, line 23), and search for an area with a low disaster rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information (see Satomi et al., column 3, lines 24-50), and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence (see Satomi et al., column 2, lines 28-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server acquire disaster information from a disaster information database that provides disaster information, and search for an area with a low disaster rate of occurrence on the basis of the acquired disaster information, and wherein the select step includes the step of: making the server select at least the data server located in an area other than the area set by the user, and the data server located in the area with the low disaster rate of occurrence in order to provide a system that is capable of rapidly and effectively making

Art Unit: 2141

and carrying out a plan for dealing with a disaster when it occurs (see Satomi et al., col. 1, lines 45-48).

9. As per claim 7, Beeler Jr. and Petersen teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data. Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data (see Satomi et al., column 2, lines 51-62). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data in order to meet the predefined priority of communication networks over which to reach a desired server.

10. As per claim 9, Beeler Jr. and Petersen teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above but fail to teach wherein information of the user's address is pre-stored in the server. Satomi et al. teaches wherein information of the user's address is pre-stored in the server (see Satomi et al., column 2, lines 51-62 and column 5, lines 14-39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein information of the user's address is pre-stored in the server because the disaster relief file can then become a process plan for providing disaster relief thereby allowing disaster relief to follow in a controlled manner.

11. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr. and Petersen as applied to claims 1, 3, and 5 above, and further in view of Satomi et

Art Unit: 2141

al. (6,347,384) and Bowman-Amuah (6,289,382). Beeler Jr. teaches the mentioned limitations of the above claims but fails to teach the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data, and a key used to decrypt the encrypted data. Satomi et al. teaches the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data (column 2, lines 51-62). And Bowman-Amuah teaches a key used to decrypt the encrypted data (column 79, lines 39-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the step of making the server send to the client terminal an address of the data server that stores the data in order to meet the predefined priority of communication networks over which to reach a desired server. And a key used to decrypt the encrypted data in order to prevent unauthorized interception of data.

12. Claims 15-19, 23-28, 33-35, 38, 61, and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. (6,069,941).

13. As per claims 15, 38, 61, and 84 Beeler, Jr. and Petersen teach the mentioned limitations of claim 12 above, but fail to teach a server, wherein said select means automatically selects the at least one data server based on the user's service subscription qualification level. However, Byrd et al. teaches a server, wherein said select means automatically selects the at least one data server based on the user's service subscription qualification level (see Byrd et al., col. 5, lines 26-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Beeler, Jr. to a server, wherein said select means automatically selects the at least one data server based on the user's service subscription qualification level in order to connect a qualified subscriber to services while monitoring the amount of service being supplied (see Byrd et al., col. 2, lines 19-35).

14. As per claim 16, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Petersen and Byrd et al. fail to teach wherein said select means selects at least two data servers. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said select means selects at least two data servers (see Beeler, Jr., column 9, lines 16-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select means selects at least two data servers in order to allow for data processing to be distributed to different computers so that each target computer has a copy of the source files, and the files are updated in real-time.

15. As per claim 17, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Petersen and Byrd et al. fail to teach wherein said sending means encrypts the data associated with the storage request using an encryption method corresponding to the at least one data server selected by said select means. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said sending means encrypts the data associated with the storage request using an encryption method corresponding to the at least one data server selected by said select means (see Beeler, Jr., column 17, lines 10-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said sending means encrypts

Art Unit: 2141

the data associated with the storage request using an encryption method corresponding to the at least one data server selected by said select means in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

16. As per claim 18, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Beeler, Jr. and Petersen fail to teach wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a subscription fee for a service. Byrd et al. however teaches wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a subscription fee for a service (see Byrd et al., column 2, lines 59-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a subscription fee for a service in order to monitor the amount of service being supplied to a subscriber.

17. As per claim 19, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Beeler, Jr. and Petersen fail to teach wherein the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a service subscription term. Byrd et al. however teaches the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a service subscription term (see Byrd et al., column 2, lines 59-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add the service subscription qualification level is determined based on a service subscription term in order to monitor the amount of service being supplied to a subscriber.

Art Unit: 2141

18. As per claim 23, Beeler, Jr., Petersen and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Beeler, Jr. and Petersen fail to teach wherein when the user's service subscription qualification level has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one server, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means. Byrd et al. however teaches wherein when the user's service subscription qualification level has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one server, (see Byrd et al., column 4, lines 27-48), and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means (see Byrd et al., column 4, lines 49-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein when the user's service subscription qualification level has changed, said select means re-selects the at least one server, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means in order to qualify the subscriber in accordance with the subscriber's telephone number.

19. As per claim 24, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Beeler, Jr. and Petersen fail to teach wherein said select means re-selects the at least one data server in accordance with a change in disaster information, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means. Byrd et al. however teaches wherein said select means re-selects the at least one data

Art Unit: 2141

server in accordance with a change in disaster information, (see Byrd et al., column 4, lines 27-48), and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means (see Byrd et al., column 4, lines 49-58). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select means re-selects the at least one data server in accordance with a change in disaster information, and said sending means sends the data associated with the storage request again to the at least one data server re-selected by said select means in order to qualify the subscriber in accordance with the subscriber's telephone number.

20. As per claim 26, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Byrd et al. and Petersen fail to teach checking means for checking authenticity of the data stored in the at least one data server. Beeler, Jr. however teaches checking means for checking authenticity of the data stored in the at least one data server (see Beeler, Jr., column 17, lines 9-21: wherein compression and encryption serves the function of authenticity). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add checking means for checking authenticity of the data stored in the at least one data server in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

21. As per claim 27, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15 and 26 above but Byrd et al. and Petersen fail to teach wherein said checking means checks authenticity by comparing data which are

Art Unit: 2141

associated with an identical storage request and are stored in a plurality of the data servers. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said checking means checks authenticity by comparing data which are associated with an identical storage request and are stored in a plurality of the data servers (see Beeler, Jr., column 18, lines 7-19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said checking means checks authenticity by comparing data which are associated with an identical storage request and are stored in a plurality of the data servers in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

22. As per claim 28, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15, and 26 above but Petersen and Byrd et al. fail to teach wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium (see Beeler, Jr., column 7, lines 34-41: wherein replication data is transmitted through a memory medium). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to a memory medium in order to prevent replicated data from being intercepted and compromised.

23. As per claim 33, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but Petersen and Byrd et al. fail to teach notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data

Art Unit: 2141

storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request. Beeler, Jr. however teaches notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request (see Beeler, Jr., column 10, lines 20-31: wherein broadcasting a message serves the function of notify means). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add notify means for sending at least various storage condition data associated with a data storage process to a client terminal that issued the storage request in order to determine if the node is configured as a target server.

24. As per claim 34, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15 and 33 above but Petersen and Byrd et al. fail to teach wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data (see Beeler, Jr., column 17, lines 9-21). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said notify means sends encryption algorithm and key data in addition to storage location data of the data associated with the storage request as the storage condition data in order to replicate the operation described in each packet to the local storage media on target server and restore data to source server when necessary.

Art Unit: 2141

25. As per claim 35, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15, and 33 above but Byrd et al. and Petersen fail to teach wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means. Beeler, Jr. however teaches wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means (see Beeler, Jr., column 10, line 65-column 11, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein the client device includes storage means for storing at least the storage condition data sent from said notify means in order to replicate the operation described in each packet to the local storage media on target server and restore data to source server when necessary.

26. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. as applied to claims 12 and 15 above, and further in view of Satomi et al. Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but fail to teach wherein said select means selects the at least one data server on the basis of disaster information. Satomi et al. however teaches wherein said select means selects the at least one data server on the basis of disaster information (see Satomi et al., column 3, lines 24-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said select means selects the at least one data server on the basis of

disaster information in order to provide a system that is capable of rapidly and effectively making and carrying out a plan for dealing with a disaster when it occurs.

27. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr., Petersen, Byrd et al., and Weinman, Jr. (2001/0047412). Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above and furthermore Byrd et al. teaches servers corresponding to the service subscription qualification level of the user who issued the storage request (see Byrd et al., col. 5, lines 26-52). But Beeler, Jr., Byrd et al., and Petersen fail to teach wherein said select means selects a data server with a lowest suffering risk from the plurality of data servers and a server with a lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the area of user's address registered by the user who issued the storage request. However Weinman, Jr. teaches wherein said select means selects a data server with a lowest suffering risk from the plurality of data servers (see Weinman, Jr., ¶ 24) and a server with a lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the area of user's address registered by the user who issued the storage request (see Weinman, Jr., ¶ 43). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. to wherein said select means selects a data server with a lowest suffering risk from the plurality of data servers and a server with a lowest suffering risk of the data servers in a different area from the area of user's address registered by the user who issued the storage request in order to mirror and relay computer data to improve continuity of data by maximizing the distance

Art Unit: 2141

between two copies of the data in synchronous mode, zero data loss environments (see Weinman, Jr., abstract).

28. Claims 29, 30, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. as applied to claims 12, 15, and 26 above, and further in view of Bowman-Amuah (6,289,382).

29. As per claim 29, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15, and 26 above but fail to teach wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data. Bowman-Amuah however teaches wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data (column 128, line 62-column 129, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein said checking means checks if data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data in order to fulfill distinct business services through well-defined interfaces.

30. As per claim 30, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12, 15, 26, and 29 above but fail to teach wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the storage request of the data. Bowman-Amuah however teaches wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the

Art Unit: 2141

storage request of the data (column 128, line 62-column 129, line 10). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add wherein when said checking means determines that the data becomes fraudulent due to tampering of data, said checking means sends a message indicating this to a client terminal that issued the storage request of the data in order to fulfill distinct business services through well-defined interfaces.

31. As per claim 31, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 12 and 15 above but fail to teach authentication means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user authenticated by said authentication means. Bowman-Amuah however teaches authentication means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user authenticated by said authentication means (column 79, lines 4-13). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add authentication means for authenticating if the user who issued the storage request is a member who subscribes to the service, and accepts only the storage request from the user authenticated by said authentication means in order to prevent unauthorized interception of data.

32. As per claim 32, Beeler, Jr., Petersen, and Byrd et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims, 12 and 15 above but fail to teach authentication means for checking authenticity of the at least one data server selected by said select means, and

Art Unit: 2141

said sending means sends data associated with the storage request in only the data server authenticated by said authentication means. Bowman-Amuah however teaches authentication means for checking authenticity of the at least one data server selected by said select means, and said sending means sends data associated with the storage request in only the data server authenticated by said authentication means (column 81, lines 47-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the above claim to add authentication means for checking authenticity of the at least one data server selected by said select means, and said sending means sends data associated with the storage request in only the data server authenticated by said authentication means in order to verify network access requests by validating that users are who they claim to be.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571) 272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status

Art Unit: 2141

information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER